

**REMARKS**

Applicants submit herewith the following remarks and preliminary Amendments to the Application.

Claims 39-50 and 56-97 are pending. Claims 39, 47, 56, 58, 59 and 64 are independent. Claims 1-38 and 51-55 have been canceled. Claim 49 has been amended. Claims 59-97 have been added.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Preliminary Amendment prior to substantive examination of this application.

**Restriction Requirement**

In the restriction requirement mailed February 7, 2006, the Examiner required restriction between the following groups of claims:

- Group I:        Claims 1-21, 39-46 and 56-57 drawn to a printed circuit board (PCB) structure, classified in class 174, subclass 258;
- Group II:       Claims 22-38 and 51-55 drawn to a connector for reducing crosstalk, classified in class 174, subclass 258; and
- Group III:      Claims 47-50 and 58 drawn to a method of designing an electrical connector, classified in class 29, subclass 825.

Applicants hereby elect Group I. Claims 39-46, 56-57 and 59-97 read on the elected Group I. Claims 1-38 and 51-55 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional application at a later date, if so desired. Claims 47-50 and 58 have not been canceled, but are indicated as being “withdrawn” in the above amendment.

Regarding Group I, the restriction requirement also sets forth an election of species requirement. Specifically, it was asserted that the following patentably distinct species were present:

- Species A: Figure 1(a), a single structured printed circuit board;
- Species B: Figure 1(a), printed circuit board with five substrates;
- Species C: Figure 3(a), printed circuit board with four substrates;
- Species D: Figure 4(a), two cooperating printed circuit boards; and
- Species E: Figure 4(b), a printed circuit board with interdigital capacitors.

Applicants note that the above listing recites structures, which are not “all” mutually exclusive species. In other words, Applicants agree that Species A and D are true alternative species; there are either one or two printed wiring boards present. Both situations cannot exist at the same time. Also, Species B and C are true alternative species. Further, a Species F should have been presented for the plate-type capacitors of Figure 2, such that Species E and Species F would have been alternative types of capacitors. In other words a capacitor is either an interdigital type capacitor or a plate-type capacitor, hence the type of capacitor is a species.

However, the Examiner’s alleged species A and B are not alternative species. It would be possible to have a single PCB with five layers, such an arrangement is illustrated in Applicants’ Fig. 1(a). The two structures are not mutually exclusive. Likewise, Species A and C are not alternatives. See Fig. 3(a), which illustrates a single PCB with four layers.

To be fully responsive to the Species Requirement, as written, Applicants elect Species A, with traverse. The traverse is based upon the position that the alleged species are not actually species, i.e. they are not mutually exclusive embodiments.

Applicants request the Examiner to consider the following election as to the actual species presented in the claims. Applicants elect:

- 1) the single printed circuit board species (the two PCB species being withdrawn);

2) the interdigital capacitor species (the plate-type capacitor species being withdrawn);  
and

3) the four substrate species (the five substrate species being withdrawn).

The following claims read on the elected group I, and the elected species: 39-46, 56-57, 59-66, 68-71, 73-75 and 79-97.

The following claims are withdrawn as being directed to the non-elected dual PCB species: 77-78. The following claims are withdrawn as being directed to the non-elected plate-type capacitor species: 67 and 72. The following claim is withdrawn as being directed to the non-elected substrate number species: 76. Applicants request rejoinder of the non-elected species claims, if a generic claim is allowable. In other words, if one of the claims from which claims 67, 72 and 76-78 depends is considered allowable, please rejoin the dependent claims and examine the withdrawn claims on their merits.

### **Conclusion**


Entry of the above amendments is earnestly solicited. An early and favorable first action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Scott L. Lowe (Reg. No. 41,458) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Scott L. Lowe

Registration No.: 41,458

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant